

such as Union Station in Washington, D.C.; the Fox Paper Mills, a mixed-used project that was once a derelict in Appleton, WI; and the Rosa True School, an eight-unit low/moderate income rental project in a historic building in Portland, Maine. In my own State of Florida, since 1974, the existing Historic Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit has resulted in over 325 rehabilitation projects, leveraging more than \$238 million in private investment. These projects range from the restoration of art deco hotels in historic Miami Beach, bringing economic rebirth to this once decaying area, to the development of multifamily housing in the Springfield Historic District in Jacksonville.

The legislation that I am introducing today builds on the familiar structure of the existing tax credit but with a different focus. It is designed to empower the one major constituency that has been barred from using the existing credit—homeowners. Only those persons who rehabilitate or purchase a newly rehabilitated home and occupy it as their principal residence would be entitled to the credit that this legislation would create. There would be no passive losses, no tax shelters, and no syndications under this bill.

Like the existing investment credit, the bill would provide a credit to homeowners equal to 20 percent of the qualified rehabilitation expenditures made on an eligible building that is used as a principal residence by the owner. Eligible buildings would be those that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, are contributing buildings in National Register Historic Districts or in nationally certified state or local historic districts or are individually listed on a nationally certified state or local register. As is the case with the existing credit, the rehabilitation work would have to be performed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation, although the bill would clarify the directive that the standards be interpreted in a manner that takes into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

The bill also makes provision for lower-income home buyers who may not have sufficient federal income tax liability to use a tax credit. It would permit such persons to receive a historic rehabilitation mortgage credit certificate which they can use with their bank to obtain a lower interest rate on their mortgage. The legislation also permits home buyers in distressed areas to use the certificate to lower their down payment.

The credit would be available for condominiums and co-ops, as well as single-family buildings. If a building were to be rehabilitated by a developer for sale to a homeowner, the credit would pass through to the homeowner. Since one purpose of the bill is to provide incentives for middle-income and more affluent families to return to older towns and cities, the bill does not discriminate among taxpayers on the basis of income. It does, however, impose a cap of \$40,000 on the amount of credit which may be taken for a principal residence.

The Historic Homeownership Assistance Act will make ownership of a rehabilitated older home more affordable for homeowners of modest incomes. It will encourage more affluent families to claim a stake in older towns and neighborhoods. It affords fiscally stressed cities and towns a way to put abandoned buildings back on the tax rolls, while strengthening their income and sales tax bases. It offers developers, realtors, and homebuilders a

new realm of economic opportunity in revitalizing decaying buildings.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is no panacea. Although its goals are great, its reach will be modest. But it can make a difference, and an important difference. In communities large and small all across this nation, the American dream of owning one's home is a powerful force. This bill can help it come true for those who are prepared to make a personal commitment to join in the rescue of our priceless heritage. By their actions they can help to revitalize decaying resources of historic importance, create jobs and stimulate economic development, and restore to our older towns and cities a lost sense of purpose and community.

I urge all Members of the House to review and support this important legislation, and I look forward to working with the Ways and Means Committee to enact this bill.

### PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS IN KOSOVO RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

**HON. MARK GREEN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 11, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 42) regarding the use of United States Armed Forces as part of a NATO peacekeeping operation implementing a Kosovo peace agreement:

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I came to the House floor today ready to use my vote to help Congress play a constructive role in the public debate over authorizing U.S. ground forces to take part in a NATO peacekeeping operation in Kosovo. I want to thank you for scheduling this debate today because I believe it is time for this body to reclaim its rightful role in the formulation of our nation's foreign policy and military affairs.

I certainly did not come to the House floor with a closed mind regarding an active role for the United States in securing a real, lasting peace in this region of the world. I wanted to vote for a responsible resolution that, without micromanaging the actions of our commander-in-chief, established several clear parameters and goals—not only for the deployment of U.S. troops, but also for future U.S. policy in the area.

Let me also say that I am not an isolationist, and recognize that as the world's sole remaining superpower, unique demands may be placed upon our military resources. The type of conflict that is the subject of today's debate is the very type that NATO must be prepared to deal with in modern times. As Serb atrocities and retaliation by Kosovar Albanians escalates, Kosovo's civilian population continues to suffer and the region inches ever closer to a larger conflict that threatens to engulf other sections of southeastern Europe.

But to involve U.S. troops in this operation without laying out clear guidelines and objectives—both for the peacekeeping forces and for future U.S. policy—would serve little purpose other than to place American fighting men and women adrift in harm's way. That is why it is with mixed emotion I must report to my colleagues that I cannot vote for this proposal as it stands today.

For our troops and for our nation, I believe we as policymakers must have the following before we can responsibly deploy ground forces:

1. A guarantee that NATO alone will supervise any Kosovo deployment—without involvement of the United Nations or other organizations that have demonstrated their incapacity to effectively handle similar situations;

2. A guarantee that U.S. troops will serve under U.S. command—not under the command of any foreign power;

3. A report outlining the amount and type of U.S. military personnel and equipment required for the operation, as well as the cost of those resources and the deployment's overall effect on military readiness;

4. A clear mission for our ground forces, explicit rules of engagement, and a realistic military timeline and exit strategy; and

5. Most important, an overall U.S. policy that recognizes Slobodan Milosevic's role as a violent and destabilizing influence for all of southeastern Europe—a policy aimed squarely and firmly at removing Milosevic from power.

The administration, unfortunately, has failed to make its case before Congress—a Congress that wants to help build a lasting peace, a real peace. There is still time for the Administration to craft a responsible policy. The crisis in Kosovo is not of recent origin. There has been plenty of time to help the American people to understand why America's sons and daughters should travel to this troubled land, to understand what it is they will do, to understand when it is that they will come home to their loved ones.

Thanks to today's robust debate, we have before us a resolution that requires many of the provisions I've previously discussed. In my opinion, however, without addressing the other conditions I've raised, the resolution remains inadequate. Without any indication from the administration that each of these conditions will be met before the deployment of ground troops to Kosovo, I have no choice but to vote "nay" on H. Con. Res. 42.

### FREE TRADE ISN'T FREE

**HON. BUD SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 17, 1999*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 975, the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act, and an avid supporter of our American steel industry and its workers I am submitting an opinion piece which I sent to newspapers in my district at the end of January as it relates to current global trade practices and the struggles of the American steel industry.

Today cheap steel imports are flooding the U.S. market, decimating the U.S. steel industry. America's steel workers are being laid off in droves, causing tremendous personal hardship for these workers and their families. Is this just an unfortunate but acceptable consequences of our global economy, or is this a serious problem which illustrates the need for a new socioeconomic paradigm?

I went to Congress a free trader, embracing Ricardo's Theory of Comparative Advantage—a very valid economic theory which states essentially that the industries of each nation should produce that which they produce most